

Meeting #7 Summary

THE MASSACHUSETTS DISTRIBUTED GENERATION INTERCONNECTION COLLABORATIVE

Friday, January 10, 2003
Room 108
The Massachusetts Technology Collaborative
Westboro, MA

44 people attended the meeting, which began at 9:00 and ended at 4:00. See attached attendance list.

I. Documents Distributed

Prior to the meeting

- a. Interim Report Filed With the DTE
- b. Agenda
- c. Meeting Summaries from 12.11 and 12.13 Meetings

At the meeting

- a. Presentation Framing How to Move Forward With Network Issues – Navigant Consulting
- b. Presentation on Network Technical Issues – Bill Feero
- c. DG Process Dispute Resolution – Suzanne Orenstein
- d. Proposal on Environmental Eligibility – Environmental Caucus
- e. Information Tracking Proposal – DOER

II. Opening Remarks

Dr. Raab welcomed the Group to the first meeting of Phase II of the Collaborative. The Group has until the end of February to finish its work on radial systems and file with the DTE. The work to be done includes completing the process flowchart, agreeing on notes to accompany it, drafting agreement forms, and developing a system of alternate dispute resolution (ADR). It will also work on network systems, including how to create uniform interconnection standards and procedures, mindful of the technical challenges inherent in network systems.

Dr. Raab said that while the Group should ideally work toward consensus on all aspects of interconnection, this may prove difficult on certain issues. Thus, the Group's goal will be a Consensus Report to the DTE. The report will describe all points of consensus but, where attaining consensus on particular is elusive, the parties will be able to attach their names to a particular position. The primary goal is make certain that the final document reflects the interests of all the parties, even if they do not reach consensus on every issue.

The second phase of the Collaborative will also seek to make more effective use of time between the meetings. Small work teams representing the various interests will meet with a facilitator between meetings to prepare the groundwork on specific issues for discussion at the plenary meetings. The work teams will not make decisions for the Collaborative; rather, they would offer proposals or identify discussion points for the plenary meetings.

Sam Nutter of the MTC explained to the Group that the MTC Board of Directors approved the additional funding requests to carry the process through February.

III. Discussion of Network Systems

Stan Blazewicz and Eugene Shlatz of Navigant Consulting delivered their presentation educating the Group on what network systems are, the differences between radial and network systems, the differences between spot and grid networks, and how DG interconnection can influence reliability. Click [here](#) to view.

During the presentation, National Grid indicated that network systems serve about 2,000 of its 1.1 million customers, and these customers are in downtown Lynn and Worcester. The other Utilities estimated that about 5% of their customers are on networks (with the exception of Nstar, which has more but is not sure exactly how many). All the Utilities will bring estimates of the amount of customers and load on secondary networks to the next meeting.

Bill Feero, consultant to the utilities, delivered a presentation on distributed resources on spot and secondary networks. Click [here](#) to view.

Afterward, Mr. Blazewicz discussed network interconnections and experience in other jurisdictions. Click [here](#) to view, see slide 15.

IV. Discussion of Alternative Dispute Resolution

Collaborative Co-Facilitator Suzanne Orenstein noted that Roger Freeman had volunteered to draft a proposal ([click](#) to view) for an ADR system.

First, Ms. Orenstein asked the group what “expedited review” of interconnection disputes should mean. She noted that Mr. Freeman’s proposal puts it at 28 calendar days. Group members voiced the following thoughts about what “expedited” should mean and how long the ADR process should take:

- It should take one to two months to finality.
- It should take as long as DTE procedures for similar cases.
- Allow 3 weeks for receipt of information.
- Enforcement of timelines is not necessarily ADR; draw a distinction between the two, as this will influence the timelines.
- It should provide a reasonable amount of time for the type of dispute to be resolved.

The group then moved to discuss the overall process framework. The Members expressed a preference for negotiating first “with elevation” (in other words, negotiation at the senior management level) to resolve the problem prior to bringing in a third party. Failing resolution there, the Group expressed a preference for mediation prior to arbitration or a formal DTE resolution.

Group members had differing views on how to proceed with cases where mediation could not resolve the dispute. Some Members advocated for an arbitration option. Others suggested that the dispute be settled by the DTE.

The Group felt that regardless of which option it settled on, the system should be judged against several criteria:

- a. Put cap on the time taken to reach resolution;
- b. Ensure the technical competency of those who render the decision;
- c. Guarantee independence and neutrality;
- d. Ensure transparency (meaning the decision becomes available publicly)
- e. Keep costs acceptable.

The Group discussed at greater length the issues of technical competency and costs. With respect to the former, the group noted that one means of ensuring technically-sound resolutions is to have a technical master. The Master could act either as a mediator/arbitrator or as a resource to the mediator/arbitrator.

The Group had a wider-ranging discussion on costs. The following comments were made by one or more of the parties but do not necessarily represent a consensus of the Group:

- For small projects, ADR costs need to be minimal.
- No-cost mediation is desirable for DG (hence having the DTE provide the service, if possible).
- Negotiation is probably the lowest-cost solution.
- There must be an incentive for both parties to move quickly.
- Evaluate costs relative to other project costs with similar project size.
- The parties should each shoulder their own costs of mediation and negotiation, but consider further how to split any arbitration costs.
- Internal costs (those to the disputants) versus external costs (borne, for example, by outside attorneys) merit consideration.

Before closing the segment on costs, the Group noted that it needed to review the demarcation between dispute resolution and enforcement. It also recognized that it needs to determine whether both parties must consent to launching into the ADR process, or whether it can be done at the behest of one party.

V. Examination of Environmental Issues

Deborah Donovan from the Union of Concerned Scientists described briefly the need for control of the negative environmental concerns associated with the operation of Distributed Generation. She then described the Environmental Caucus proposal that a DG

show the Utility that the DG has a permit or a written waiver from the DEP allowing it to interconnect. The rule would apply to an existing facility with a permit, a facility under construction in need of a permit, and those that do not need a permit under present regulations.

Group members had the following questions/comments on the proposal:

- Is it reasonable to require presenting the permit before final interconnection, as opposed to require showing it *prior* to the Utility's review of the application?
- Does this proposal require the DTE to be the environmental police for the DEP?
- Is interconnection the right forum for achieving environmental issues?
- NSTAR is obliged to collect permits when they execute other duties (such as checking building permits); this may be in line with other requirements the Utilities already fulfill.
- National Grid prefers that DG apply for permit/waiver before utility reviews.
- The Group should define clean, renewable, emissions, and not disadvantage energy efficiency.
- Rewrite the second paragraph.
- Pre-certify equipment to minimize procedural delays.
- Can these requirements be developed to minimize time delays?
- Have the utility tell the DEP when a DG has been interconnected instead of requiring the DG to get a permit.

V. Development of Workplan

The Group reviewed, slightly revised, and approved the Workplan proposed by the Mediators (see next page).

It then turned its focus to the first round of meetings of the work teams, which will take place Thursday, January 16 at the MTC Campus. The four teams and the items they will focus on are as follows:

- **Team 1 (morning):** Outstanding issues on interconnection requirements to radial networks.
 - o Look at figure/notes
 - o Interconnection Requirements
 - o Application
- **Team 2 (afternoon):** ADR/Forms to design an ADR Process
 - o Develop the actual agreement. This includes post-installation operating/maintenance agreement, perhaps as an exhibit to the agreement, and insurance/indemnification.
 - o Revisit compliance incentives/penalties.
- **Team 3 (afternoon):** Network process: Thu 1/16 afternoon
 - o Come up w/ principles for dealing with network interconnection.
 - o Is there anything that can go through a simplified process similar to that for machines less than 10 kW inverter-based machines on radial networks?
 - o What is a process to put into place to learn/study over time.
- **Team 4:** Information/annual review, long-term process.

DG Workplan

January - February 2003

Plenary	1/10	1/17	1/29	2/14	2/26	2/28
Report				Complete Draft Report	Review Final Report	File Final Report with DTE
<i>Network Interconnection Issues</i>	Issues / Options					
Spot/Grid Process			Approach / Outline			
<i>Radial Interconnection Issues</i>						
Figure Text/Notes		Draft Language	Finalize Language			
Timeline/Fees			Finalize			
<i>Joint Issues/Other</i>						
ADR Process/Compliance	Issues / Options		Proposal			
Environmental Issues	Revisit		Revised Proposal			
Information Policies		Proposal	Finalize Language			
Interconnection Requirements		Issues / Options	Draft			
Queuing		Issues / Options	Draft			
Application/Agreement Forms		Issues / Options	Draft			

Teams and Deliverables

	1/10	1/17	1/29	2/14	2/26	2/28
Work Teams						
Network Process			X	X	X	
Radial Process		X		X	X	
ADR/Forms		X	X	X	X	

Information		X	X	X	X	
Navigant Potential Products						
	1/10	1/17	1/29	2/14	2/26	2/28
	Network Presentation		Engineering Requirements Draft Network Approach			

VI. To Do

- Bring estimates of the amount of customers and load on secondary networks – Utilities
- Provide Raab Associates with list of members to each work team on 1/16 – all Members
- Post DOER's information tracking document on the Collaborative website and circulate to the group.
- Meeting Summary – Raab Associates
- Agenda for 1/12 – Raab Associates

Organization	Name	1/10
DG PROVIDERS		
Aegis Energy Services	Spiro Vardakas	X
SEBANE	Steve Cowell	X
SEBANE (alternate)	Ed Kern	X
SEBANE/Zapotec (alternate)	Paul Lyons	X
E-Cubed	Peter Chamberlain	X
E-Cubed (alternate)	Ruben Brown	X
Ingersoll-Rand	Jim Watts	X
Ingersoll-Rand (alternate)	Jim Avery	X
Ingersoll-Rand (alternate)	Tim O'Connell	X
NAESCO	Don Gilligan	
Northeast CHP Initiative	Sean Casten	X
Turbosteam	Tim Walsh	X
NECA	Larry Plitch	
NECA (alternate)	Tobey Winters	
Real Energy	Roger Freeman	X
Real Energy (alternate)	Tim Daniels	X
UTC	Herb Healy	X
UTC (alternate)	Heather Hunt	
Keyspan	Pat Crowe	
Keyspan	Joe Niemiec	X
Keyspan	Chuck Berry	
Keyspan	Rich Johnson	
Plug Power	Lisa Potter	
Plug Power	Rudy Stegemoeller	
Trigen Energy	Dave Doucette	
GOVERNMENT/QUASI GOVERNMENT		
DOER	Dwayne Breger	
DOER (alternate)	Gerry Bingham	X
DOER (alternate)	David Rand	
MTC	Sam Nutter	X
MTC (alternate)	Judy Silvia	
MTC (alternate)	Raphael Herz	X
MTC (alternate)	Fran Cummings	X
Attorney General's office	Joseph Rogers	
Attorney General's office	Judith Laster	
Attorney General's office	Patricia Kelley	
Cape Light Compact	Margaret Downey	
Cape Light Compact	Kitt Johnson	X
DEM		
DTE	Paul Afonso	
CONSUMERS		
AIM	Angie O'Connor	

for Solutia and MeadWestVac Co.	Andy Newman	
for Wyeth	Lisa Barton	
for Wyeth	Susan Richter	
UTILITIES		
Unitil/FG&E	John Bonazoli	X
Unitil/FG&E (alternate)	Justin Eisfeller	
ISO-NE	Henry Yoshimura	
ISO-NE (alternate)	Carolyn O'Connor	
ISO-NE (2 nd Alternate)	Eric Krathwohl	
NSTAR	Larry Gelbien	X
NSTAR (alternate)	Dave Dishaw	X
NSTAR (alternate)	Mary Grover	X
NSTAR (alternate)	Dan Butterfield	X
WMECO/NU	Doug Clarke	X
WMECO/NU (alternate)	Mary Duggan	X
WMECO/NU (alternate)	Cindy Janke	X
WMECO/NU (alternate)	Steve Klionsky	X
WMECO/NU (alternate)	Rich Towsley	
WMECO/NU (alternate)	Leo Rancourt	X
NGRID	Tim Roughan	X
NGRID (alternate)	John Bzura	X
NGRID (alternate)	Mary Grover	X
NGRID (alternate)	Amy Rabinowitz	X
NGRID (alternate)	Peter Zschokke	X
PUBLIC INTEREST GROUPS		
UCS, MassPIRG, and CLF	Deborah Donovan	X
UCS, MassPIRG, and CLF	Frank Gorke	
UCS, MassPIRG, and CLF	Seth Kaplan	
Mass Energy Consumers Alliance	Larry Chretien	X
Mass Energy Consumers Alliance	Leslie Grossman	
COLLABORATIVE TEAM		
Raab Associates	Jonathan Raab	X
Raab Associates	Joel Fetter	X
Raab Associates	Colin Rule	X
Facilitation Consultant	Suzanne Orenstien	X
Navigant Consulting	Stan Blazewicz	X
Navigant Consulting	Eugene Shlatz	X
OTHER		
Unaffiliated	Bill Feero	X